India

FOR THE

No. 88. New Series.] No. 182. Old Series.] WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1899. [Registered as a Newspaper. { Price...... 2d { By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 117
Reversion to Autocracy 120
The Low Rupee 121
Calcutta Municipal Bill 122
Notes from Bombay 122
Lord G. Hamilton and India 123
The Indian Budget Debate: Indian Press Opinions 124
Autocratic Rule in India 124
British Capital and India's Needs... 126
British Indians in Natal 127
Advertisements 128

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD SANDHURST'S reception of plague workers and volunteers of the city of Poona at Ganeshkhind was an interesting function, not without sympathetic elements. Thus his lordship said:—

> I cannot omit to give expression to our recognition of the work that you men have taken upon yourselves—namely, of assisting your fellow-townsmen in their distress by explanation and persuasion, duties frequently thankless, capable also of misconstruction, and sometimes of bitter criticism; but never mind all that, but be patient under it, keep up your courage, and you will always have the satisfaction of knowing that you have done your utmost to fulfil the highest duties of citizenship in a time of unparalleled disaster.

Very well, but that is just what the Natus did. Why did Lord Sandhurst miss the golden opportunity of giving real validity to his words by setting the Natus free on the spot?

There has already appeared in a recent number of India an account of the public meeting in which the authorities of Belgaum met the people of that town and expounded to them the virtues of inoculation. Apparently the effect was not sufficient, for on August 8, some three weeks after the first meeting, a second was convened. As before, Mr. Capper took the chair, but he had again to encounter some opposition. This was especially directed to the order of General Sir Reginald Hart which required all Indians living in the cantonment to be inoculated or suffer expulsion. Especially noteworthy was the speech of Mr. Moidinkhar Kalaiwalla, who spoke on behalf of the Mahometan community. While giving the officials all credit for acting according to their lights, he spoke of "the fear and horror which plague measures had inspired among Mahometan families." He produced a paper from the superintendent of his ward insisting upon his vacating his house if he were not inoculated. This is the official idea of "voluntary" inoculation. Another speaker urged that the plague had almost run its course before inoculation was introduced, so that that measure could not be considered the cause of the decrease in the number of deaths.

The *Times of India*, like other Anglo-Indian organs, has always favoured strong measures of plague prevention; but in the case of Belgaum it has opened its columns to a discussion of the proceedings taken by those in authority. This has brought it into ill favour with Sir Reginald Hart, who expressed his surprise at the meeting that anyone should have referred to "an anonymous letter in a newspaper." Our contemporary thereupon, while wishing the authorities success in their endeavours to bring about general inoculation, adds:—

> Judging, however, from the temper in which some of them have applied themselves to the task, we have some misgiving as to whether their measures are calculated to attain the end in view. Tact and good temper are above all things necessary in such an enterprise.

The General's comments are spoken of as "ill-timed and ill-tempered," and it is pointed out that to call a public meeting was "to court criticism and suggestion."

We publish in another column an ominous cable from our Calcutta correspondent. No less than twenty-eight elected Commissioners of the municipality have resigned office in a body. It had been alleged that some of the elected members were corrupt, an allegation put forth in support of the gerrymandering and abridgment of the existing Corporation. The Corporation naturally at once requested specific details; but their request appears to have been met by an answer which they regard as discourteous. Hence the resignation *en masse*. "All the prominent and most experienced men"—some of them with the experience of a quarter of a century—have washed their hands of the business. The discourtesy of the Government is merely the occasion, though in itself a quite sufficient cause, of the unhappy result. But to this complexion it was bound to come eventually. The result was distinctly foreshadowed in the famous "Note of Dissent," and we had ourselves pointed out repeatedly that no self-respecting Natives could continue to give their services under responsibility in the new conditions. We warned the authorities of the danger of their policy, and we asked them to consider how they were to govern Calcutta without the assistance and the cordial goodwill of the Native population, and especially of the leaders of Native opinion. We now, once more, ask the same question.

The *Morning Leader*, discussing the significance of the event, devotes an able article to the subject. It sketches the situation, contrasts the Jingo furor in favour of the Transvaal Uitlanders with the unsympathetic "treatment of the Indians, who are made Uitlanders in their native land," remarks on the "noisy and powerful group" of Anglo-Indians who "have always watched municipal self-government in India with jealous eyes," and explains the aggressive and destructive action of the Government against the Corporation in spite of the fact that "the Corporation was so zealous in sanitary measures that it was able to keep the plague at a distance." It concludes thus:—

> Such is our treatment of Indians in their own country; such our mode of strengthening British rule in India. Yet, as the *Times* said on July 12 last (*with reference to British Indians in the Transvaal*), these men are "the fellow-countrymen of the young cricketer who held the wicket at Notts for England, of the young scholar bracketed Senior Wrangler at Cambridge this summer, of the young administrator who the other year headed the Indian Civil Service list, of the young savant who lately received an ovation from English men of science, and of the young Indian artist who has just arrived with good will from Paris, Munich and Rome." What, we wonder, will the *Times* say to-day?

It is easy enough for men that do not know Calcutta or the East, and that despise the Babu and all his works, to talk confidently of a British official administration. We shall see. They laugh best that laugh longest.

The following message was forwarded to the Government of India at Simla jointly by Mr. Manmohan Ramjee, President of the Bombay Native Piece-Goods Merchants' Association, and Mr. Luckumsey Nappoo, President of the Bombay Grain Merchants' Association, on August 17:—

> Associations respectfully pray Viceregal Legislative Council that the proposed Telegraphic Press Messages Bill will be finally considered and disposed of at Calcutta, where there will be ample opportunity to learn to their fullest extent the views entertained by Native mercantile community on the subject. Beyond the cogent arguments already addressed to the Council by other public bodies and organisations, our Associations beg to point out that the prohibition to comment on press telegraphic news will have a prejudicial effect on trade interests, having regard to the fact that comments in leading and well-informed vernacular Press on trade matters are greatly appreciated. It is well known that the trade in wheat, rice, cotton, piece-goods and other commodities passes in the first instance principally through Native hands. When rings and corners are fenced to bull or bear prices in these commodities, well reasoned and prompt comments in the vernacular Press immediately following telegraphic news have a wholesome and salutary influence on the trade. That check will be lost by the proposed measure. Associations, from their practical experience, are of belief that the trades referred to, which are of paramount importance to the country at large, will suffer. They therefore respectfully beg that the Council will rather postpone the final consideration of the Bill till Calcutta Session, or omit from the Bill the clause which makes it prohibitory to comment on the news for sixty hours.

We are very pleased to learn that Mr. John Adam, barrister-at-law, has been offered and has accepted a Professorship in the Law College at Madras. Before joining the Bar some five years ago, Mr. Adam had held the responsible office of Principal of Pachaiyappa's College somewhere about ten years. His experience as a teacher will greatly reinforce his exceptional learning as a jurist, and there can be no doubt that his appointment will give both strength and confidence to the Law College, which has recently been subjected to very stringent criticism. The appointment is all the more gratifying inasmuch as Mr. Adam has always been a prominent, though always a judicious, supporter of every sensible and safe form of Native development and advancement. He has frequently taken part, with marked efficiency, in the deliberations of the Congress, and has written many papers on various questions of large public interest. His appointment, therefore, may be taken as a sign, not only of his own independent character and level headedness, but of a wise disposition on the part of the Governor, Sir Arthur Havelock. We can only regard the professorship as a step. For Mr. Adam has already proved that he is eminently capable of serving the State in a much higher capacity.

We print in another column a letter addressed to the editor of the *Investors' Review*, with his comments thereon. The writer remarks incidentally :—

> With the Native magistrate (I am not, of course, speaking of those of high standing, though even these are not always without reproach, as recent prosecutions have shown), the longest purse gains the cause. Over and over again have I been told this by men of my regiment and others. . . . . Bad as it was under the old Native rulers, with the complex machinery of British rule the number of petty Native officials all requiring bribes is multiplied tenfold.

There is surely some misunderstanding here. In the first place we must put aside everything of the nature of the English "tip," which is well-known as an instrument of marvellous potency, not always distinguished from a "bribe." Next, a distinction is to be drawn between an attempt to tamper with a "magistrate" of whatever class and the too frequent process of preparing witnesses to give evidence before the magistrate. We do not exactly understand what is meant by Native magistrates "of high standing," but we should like to know what the writer has in view when he speaks of "recent prosecutions" as having "shown" that such officials are "not always without reproach." We invite him to specify the cases. Writing in 1885, in his admirable volume "New India," Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, the greatest of all our present Indian administrators, wrote :—

> The superiority of the Natives of the country in administering law and justice to their own people is, indeed, a fact that cannot be seriously disputed. The intellectual attainments and high moral virtues of Dwarkanath Mitter sufficiently vindicate the competence of Natives to exercise the most responsible functions. He sat for many years upon the bench of the High Court of Judicature in Bengal. Other Native gentlemen might also be mentioned, who before and after him have occupied the same post and acquitted themselves with credit. At the same time the judicial appointments in the lower grades of the service are already filled by Natives, and there is abundant testimony to show that they discharge their duties with integrity and ability.

Nor has there been any deterioration since 1885, as can be amply demonstrated on official evidence. On this point, then, the correspondent of the *Investors' Review* has fallen into serious error. Otherwise, his letter is well worth its space.

The Editor's comment is very noteworthy. Mr. Wilson enforces, with all the authority of high financial experience and insight, the contention that we ourselves have steadily put forward. It is the "inconsiderate speed to mortgage the country that we deprecate."

> Would we stop developments, then? By no means; but, since the Natives, whether from ignorance, habit, or distrust of us, refuse to lend us their savings for the purpose, we should execute public works almost entirely by means of the surplus revenues that would accrue were the country administered with economy and prudence. . . . The people, in short, would be enriched by this mode of development, and our power consolidated.

This, unhappily, is just what our administration have not done. "We have laboured like Trojans or Roman galley slaves to place buffer States and frontier fortifications between us and the dreaded Russian North-West Frontier, and all the same time have neglected to protect ourselves against the enemy we have been creating within our own borders." There must be a change in the spirit of our administration.

> And, after all, everything hangs on finance. Sound, honest, economical administration will consolidate and perpetuate our rule; extravagance will sap and destroy it. To borrow in England in order to cover the ravages of extravagance is but to hasten the end.

Here lies the way of true statesmanship—not in artificial manipulations of the currency, not in fantastic notions of autocratic imperialism, not in military enterprises to dazzle the vision of the people at home, but in "sound, honest, and economical administration."

Though gunner Love has been acquitted on the charge of murdering an Indian while out shooting, the theory of the prosecution as to the cause of dispute having broken down, the case, nevertheless, serves to bring once more before the public the dangers which beset the granting of shooting passes to soldiers. In the Anglo-Indian *Madras Mail* there is a strongly-worded letter on the subject which well deserves attention. The writer says :—

> It may be taken for granted that only a tithe of the disturbances to which this practice gives rise find their way into the columns of the Press.

After giving an account of a case which had come to his notice, and in which the trouble arose through the soldiers killing a peacock in ignorance, he goes on :—

> They were men of good character with the average ignorance of Native ways which marks Tommy Atkins. . . . . In my opinion the ordinary soldier with his ignorance of the language and of Native customs and with his vulgar contempt for "niggers," as he calls them, is emphatically a man not to be trusted with a pass. Be his character never so good, he is almost certain to get into a mess through some careless action which is quite justifiable in his eyes, but which would enrage the mildest Hindu ever born.

He therefore asks whether the issue of shooting passes to private soldiers should not be discontinued altogether.

The *Hindu* is informed that gunner Page of the Royal Artillery, who was charged by the military police with assaulting two Hindu ladies, has been sentenced to seven days in the cells. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, though opposed to heavy sentences, cannot help comparing this with the sentence of twenty years' penal servitude in the Shaharanpur railway assault case for an offence not much graver than the present one.

The treatment of coolies in Assam is a question that should engage the attention of the authorities. In Sylhet, rioting cases increased from 486 in 1894 to 530 in 1898. Both numbers are sufficiently alarming, even though most of "these are not of a serious character, being merely petty disputes between the managers and the coolies." The *Pioneer* goes on :—

> Riots occur, however, with sufficient frequency to necessitate vigorous action being taken to suppress them, as the small European staff on the tea gardens are exposed to great risk of injury from gangs of discontented coolies.

But are coolies usually discontented without cause, and are they not also exposed to great risk from rash or tyrannical managers?

Mr. Ross, not satisfied with his acquittal, has thought fit to write a letter in the Press blackening the character of his Indian neighbours. These allegations are denied by a correspondent of the *Sanjibani*, who asserts that the ancestors of the villagers, far from being thieves and dacoits, received their villages in free gift from the Rájás of Cachar, that the charges of theft are unfounded, and that the Natives are not prowling with guns on the look-out for revenge. The condition of the villagers is described as deplorable, the military police keeping them from their own jungles, as well as from the disputed ground, so that they are thinking of selling their land and migrating elsewhere. *Power and Guardian* believes that in view of these contradictory assertions, the Government should hold an enquiry to ascertain the real state of affairs at Mohanpur.

Sir Antony MacDonnell has decided that there is nothing in the so-called "municipal scandal at Cawnpore." The careful and voluminous report of the sub-committee which investigated the matter showed that there was absolutely nothing to indicate fraudulent dealings. "All that the impeachment had been the means of bringing to light was the fact that no complete list of the municipal roads was in existence."

The *Daily News* lately commended the Natal Assembly and Council for their liberal and enlightened views on the equality of all British citizens in those parts, by way of counterblast to the illiberal and benighted views of the Government of the South African Republic. We have already shown, by ghastly examples of tyrannical oppression, how decidedly Natal excludes our British Indian fellow-subjects from the circle of British citizens, forgetting in their day of prosperity the very essential aid they derived from British Indians in their day of very small things indeed. In another column we reprint from the *Times of India*—the foremost of Anglo-Indian journals, be it observed—a letter from a Durban correspondent on the action of Natal in respect to the education of the children of British Indians. The *Manchester Guardian* (Sept. 5) has also reprinted it, and thus given it bold advertisement. We trust it will fall under the eye of the *Daily News*, and we shall be interested to learn whether the leading Liberal paper will regard Natal as liberal and enlightened on this question. It is amazing that men of English descent should so far forget their own history and the dictates of mere common humanity at the urgency of a wretched business rivalry. If this is our grand Imperialism, it is high time to prepare for the inevitable end.

We believe confidently, however, that the report will disgust and anger the masses of the English people to whose knowledge it may come. The British Indian schools in Natal have never been decently housed, taught, or supported. Even Indians of the rank of "clerks, interpreters, storekeepers," and the like, have shrunk from sending their children to them; and the difficulties of admission to the Government schools have been all but insuperable. "Latterly," says the correspondent, "very few Indian children, hardly half-a-dozen, have been able to enter the public primary schools, and that after undergoing immense difficulties." Now the Government "have made a big bid for popularity" by shutting the doors of the elementary schools against Indian children. They have, however, "opened what they are pleased to call a higher grade school for Indian children, which is supposed to be in all respects equal to the above schools." But no provision is made for girls; and, as to the boys, "there is absolutely no provision for the Indians to go beyond the three R's"! However willing and able an Indian may be to give his children a decent education, he is "simply unable to do so owing to the Government restrictions." What a scandalous farce it is to teach Christianity under these conditions!

> The dissatisfaction that the latest move on the part of the Natal Government in the matter of education has caused amongst the Indian converts to Christianity, of whom there is a large number, is indeed very intense. They, of all others, know fully, and have been taught to understand, the advantages of Western culture. They are taught by their religious teachers the doctrine of equality. They are told, Sunday after Sunday, that their Great Master knew no distinction between a Jew and a Gentile, a European or an Asiatic.

But the liberal and enlightened Government, taught by their freedom-loving British constituents, know better than the missionaries! Such a community is a disgrace to the British name.

The London correspondent of the *Hamburgischer Correspondent* (Aug. 11, Evening Edition) writes with drastic discrimination on the Indian Budget. He found the single formal annual discussion of the affairs of 288,000,000 people brought on, as usual, in an all but empty House just before the close of the Session. He counted 16 members on the Liberal side, and 10 on the Government benches; and "a number of the honourable gentlemen on both sides slept the sleep of the just—or of the unjust." He descried in the gallery "three turbaned and dusky sons of Hindustan," and imagines that they may have been astonished at the emptiness of the House. He remarks on the effect of the Indian Secretary's salary being beyond the control of the House. Paying a handsome compliment to Sir William Wedderburn's personal knowledge of India and his services in the cause of the rayats, he points out how the motion he seconded was borne down by a crowd from the outer precincts of the House, who had not listened to the debate. "All appeared to be well for India." But, he goes on, "it is not so"; and he lays his finger remorselessly on weak joints in the armour of British complacency. He sees through the absurdity of Lord George Hamilton's boast of the record surplus, and recalls the hardships of the tax on salt. He comments on the rough conduct of British soldiers in India, and says rather unpleasant things about the recent campaigns, and about the future defences of the North-West. It is well to see ourselves as others see us, but our authorities might enable us to present a more satisfactory appearance to critical onlookers.

The mysterious transference of arms and ammunition from the custody of the Government of India to the hands of transfrontier tribesmen has always been a puzzle to officialdom, and especially in recent years. Now an armourer-sergeant of a British battalion has been found guilty of the theft of a Lee-Metford rifle and sentenced by court martial to seven years' penal servitude and discharged from the service with ignominy and with forfeiture of a brand new decoration. We do not know whether a correspondent of the *Times* is right in taking this to be the first case "in which European complicity has been proved." One would hope it is, and also that it is the first case in which there was European complicity at all. The correspondent points to the temptation:—

> On the Peshawar frontier the market value of a Lee-Metford rifle is a small fortune. A thousand rupees have been repeatedly given by transfrontier tribesmen for this weapon, while during the recent fighting a serviceable Martini was assessed at over 500 rupees.

If there is a small fortune on the one side, it is right that it should be counterbalanced very decidedly by a heavy misfortune on the other side. If the thief had been, not an English, but a native Indian soldier, would seven years have been the expiation?

The *Manchester Guardian* discerns in the renewed activity of Ishak Khan, on the Northern frontier of Afghanistan, "an ominous sign of the troubles that may be expected on the death of the Ameer." Our contemporary says:—

> Ishak is the cousin of the Ameer, and the only man who ever raised a formidable rebellion against him. For several years after the Ameer's accession he was Governor of Afghan Turkestan; but one day hearing a circumstantial rumour of his death, Ishak set out at the head of a large army to lay claim to the Crown. The rumour was false—it was the same story that reached India in September, 1888—and Ishak was defeated by Gholam Hyder and fled across the Oxus into Russian territory, where he has remained in exile ever since. Whether a similar rumour was the occasion of the present movement we are not told. This time Ishak himself does not appear to have led the invading force, perhaps because the Russians kept too close a watch on his movements, or possibly because he is by all the accounts a somewhat timid man and preferred that his son Ismail should run the risk of defeat and capture. Ismail was defeated; but the obstinacy of the fighting shows how strong the following of Ishak still is in Afghanistan. It is possible that he was once more acting on a rumour of the Ameer's death; if not, he would seem to have blundered in not holding up his resources until the end, which cannot now be very long delayed, should come. Even after his defeat he is probably the most formidable of all the rivals that Habibullah will have to deal with on his father's death.

The Russian semi-official organ, the *Turkestan Journal*, says the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, "protests strongly against what it describes as the unfounded allegations of the Anglo-Indian Press to the effect that the tranquillity and security of Afghanistan are being endangered by Russian intrigues, and categorically denies the report circulated by them of a collision between Russian and Afghan troops in the neighbourhood of Herat." However this may be, and whether or not "such reports are part of a system intended to pave the way for British intervention in Afghanistan on the death of the Amir," it looks as if we were again to be troubled by Russian scares just when we were hoping that the Government of India would be free to turn its undivided energies to the internal recuperation of the country. It is also reported that a Russian navigation company is projecting the establishment of a service between Aden and Basra, to be worked in connexion with the boats of the Russian volunteer cruiser fleet, which touch at Aden. Russian commerce with Southern Persia and Arabia is of small account, but it may be deemed capable of expansion. These movements are of course to be watched carefully. But it is to be hoped that the Government of India will be slow to rush into further warlike preparations without the most definite and clear reasons. We have been befooled more than enough in the past, and ought to have learned some elements of practical wisdom by this time.

REVERSION TO AUTOCRACY.

ENGLISHMEN have always been divided as to the aims which should be pursued in our government of India. Many have thought, though few have had the courage to say, that we are there solely for our own advantage; that care for the happiness of the Indians must always be subordinate to the safety of our Empire; and that every policy is to be judged according as it strengthens and renders more valuable our grasp on the country. Among those who shrink from this bald statement of Imperial selfishness there are some who have managed to persuade themselves that our present system is the best possible for the Indians, and is capable of enduring for ever; but such a plethora of official optimism is becoming every day more difficult for thinking men in view of the financial and other problems which confront the Indian Government. Everywhere there is evidence that India is in a state of transition. Even the authorities themselves feel that things cannot remain as they are, and, being unwilling to go forward, they strive to go back. There have been others who, in the face of the grave burdens and dangers of our Indian Empire to England, have felt a longing for immediate evacuation, but the interests involved, both English and Indian, have been too serious. There remained, then, the policy of gradually training up the Indians to take part in the government of their country, of accepting them as fellow-citizens of the Empire and as colleagues in the administration, of infusing into them all that is best in Western civilisation in union with all that was best in Eastern, and of admitting them to share in our heritage of liberty and progress. Such were the hopes of the English friends of India. But Mr. Theodore Morison tells us that this is all a delusion. Not in liberty, but in autocracy, lies the true hope of India. We have destroyed the old autocracies of India, which had become rooted in the soil, in order to supply their place with a futile imitation. The old English monarchy of the Tudors is to be furbished up for exportation. The East is to be clothed in the cast-off garments of the West.

We have already reviewed Mr. Morison's book in some detail. Here we are only concerned with his main principle—that the Government of that country should be carried on directly by the Crown, the people being united in support of the Government by loyalty to the person of the monarch. It is impossible to doubt the good faith of the author: but it is equally difficult to see in him an impartial and experienced observer. His Indian career has been passed as a teacher at Aligarh College, and the peculiarities of that institution can hardly have failed to colour his views of the country. There is much to be admired in the root idea of Aligarh—a Mahometan College which shall combine moral with intellectual training, and in which, as in an English public school, a common life shall aid in the development of character and the regulation of conduct. The building up of men is a nobler task than the giving of bare instruction. But with this lofty aim there has been combined a political ideal of a less worthy kind. "Aligarh" has come to sum up all the forces that keep Mahometan and Hindu apart. Loyalty is no doubt a virtue; but so is patriotism. It has been the political principle of Aligarh that true loyalty is the exclusive appanage of the Mahometans among Indians and that the English should recognise in them their especial friends. Mr. Morison makes a great deal of the hostility between Mahometan and Hindu. But of the feeling that keeps the two communities apart and prevents them from joining in the service of their country, Aligarh is the great nursery. No wonder, then, that Mr. Morison exaggerates this feeling.

The book did not find favour with the Press. English, Indian, and Anglo-Indian papers alike rejected its main principle. The fatal dilemma—Is the Queen's direct rule to be a sham or a reality?—could not be escaped; for in the first case the solemn farce would evoke no loyalty in India, and in the second, the old liberties of England would be endangered. This general chorus of scepticism or ridicule was broken by a review in the form of a letter which appeared in the *Spectator* of August 26. It was signed by Professor Dicey, and in it Mr. Morison's conclusions were set forth with much skill and considerable praise. But alas! In a second instalment which appeared a week later, and the substantial parts of which we print elsewhere in our present issue, while still full of compliments to the author, Professor Dicey declares that Mr. Morison's "conception of Imperialism grounded on personal loyalty to the Empress lies entirely outside the range of practical politics." At most he will admit the possibility of a subordinate monarchy in our empire like the subordinate Republics of Canada and New Zealand. He comes back to the old dilemma. To demand loyalty for a Constitutional Queen is indirectly to demand loyalty to the English race, whose wishes must sway her counsels. And on the other hand for the Queen to exercise the authority of a Tudor Monarch in India would mean that she must be able to overrule the wishes of her Parliamentary Ministers in England, which would cut at the very root of Constitutional practice. As to the idea that England would submit to autocracy in order to provide "a form of government which will not be degrading" to our Indian fellow-subjects, Professor Dicey scoffs at it:—

> Englishmen will never surrender for themselves and their children the hard won liberties of England for the sake of conferring upon Mahometans and Hindus the dubious benefits of benevolent despotism.

The *Spectator* has made these two letters the text of an article. Our contemporary begins by lamenting that the British power has no other basis than the British bayonet. Though the body of the people acquiesce in our rule "they do not like us, and are nowhere genuinely loyal;" and it is led in the end to consider that the only chance of our ceasing to rely entirely on British bayonets is to secure the fidelity of one of the fighting races of India, who would undertake the task of maintaining our rule over their countrymen in our stead. But the *Spectator* is not enthusiastic, though the plan is its own. It even goes on to say:—

> For the present we must, we fear, go on as at present; keep a strong garrison in India; keep the real people—the three hundred millions—acquiescent by justice, lenity and wisely conservative taxation; and wait patiently to see what the purpose of Providence may be in trusting India to us.

It would be idle to pretend that we do not understand who are to be contrasted with "the real people." It is those who have been most ready to accept what the West has offered them, who have come forward to share the intellectual heritage of England, and who by so doing have given the strongest pledges of their fidelity to British rule. These men may not be loyal in Mr. Morison's sense; their loyalty may not be the spring of their political action. But they certainly have a very real veneration and affection for the person of the Queen-Empress, and they see very clearly that their whole future is bound up with the continuance of British power. Their cardinal sin is that they have wished to cease to be strangers in their own land, that they have spoken in the language of English liberty, and that they have asked for a larger share in the government of the country. Certainly if their requests be ignored England will have thrown away its one great chance of founding its empire on any other force than that of English bayonets.

The *Spectator*, however, is even less favourable to Mr. Morison's grand plan than is Professor Dicey. It points out that Indian loyalty is given much less to birth than to power. "Outside Rajpootana and Travancore no Indian's birth has ever prevented his seizing the throne." The Indian princes of the present day "are in the immense majority of cases quite new men." On the other hand, the Indian believes that "to protect the good, to dominate the bad, is the Mahárája's first duty." But such autocracy is impossible for an English monarch, and even if possible it is undesirable:—

> The "Simla group" is dangerous enough, but imagine the Simla group with an autocrat in its hands! India would be as Russia, with this aggravation, that the Russian autocrat can send an evil Secretary of State to Siberia, and an English autocrat could not."

It is obvious that these considerations are as strongly opposed to Professor Dicey's suggestion of a subordinate monarchy in India—to the possibility of which he will not commit himself—as they are to the original scheme of Mr. Morison. They go to the root of all exercise of autocratic power in India by a monarch of English race.

And amid all this talk about autocracy, the fabrication of new monarchies in India, and the ruin of old constitutions in England, is it not worth while to ask whether self-government is necessarily alien to the genius of the Indians, and whether "loyalty" to the person of a

monarch is the sole possible foundation of stability and order? We are told that all ideas of local self-government have been introduced by faddists ignorant of the history and character of the Indian people. Never was there a greater delusion. Mr. H. J. S. Cotton, now Chief-Commissioner of Assam, says ("New India," p. 82):—

> The people of India possess an instinctive capacity for local self-government, which centuries of misrule have not eradicated. The inhabitants of an Indian village under their own princes formed a sort of petty republic, the affairs of which were managed by hereditary officers, any unfit person being set aside by popular judgment in favour of a more acceptable member of his family.

These village republics were undermined by the centralising tendencies of British rule. If reformers have endeavoured to plant in India a system of local self-government, they have but sought to develop and extend and harmonise with modern conditions the old institutions of the country. Not by the creation of a sham autocracy in India, nor by the abandonment of the free constitution of England, can loyalty be manufactured in India; but in proportion as India becomes self-governing, as its local liberties become more sure, and as the high posts of Government are opened to indigenous merit, so will contentment spread, and true patriotism arise to be the strength and safety of the Indian Empire.

THE LOW RUPEE.

THE Government of India is rejoicing over the record surplus and looking forward to a placid voyage on golden seas not within the ken of any other set of human observers. It has not relieved the country of a single pice of taxation nor given any indication of relief in the glowing future. The surplus, which everybody else regards as accidental, artificial and delusive, is locked up in the Government chests to constitute a basis for the preposterous gold standard; and operations are going forward for the establishment of a brand new bank, which, by virtue of governmental legerdemain, is going to accomplish results beyond the well-tried powers of the banks already in existence. There is a good time coming—long as it has been delayed. For has not Lord George Hamilton proclaimed the advent of "exuberant recuperation" of the material condition of India? More than that, the reconciliation of the interests of the Indian people with the interests of the Indian Government has been found in the institution of the gold standard! In his last annual statement (August 8: INDIA, August 11, p. 75, col. 2) Lord George spoke triumphantly:—

> Attempts have been made to try and show that, although a gold standard might be beneficial to the Indian Government on account of the large gold obligations they have annually to meet in this country, yet it would be detrimental to the interests of the general community; that India was too poor a country for a gold standard; that it is an exporting country, and that a fall in exchange was beneficial to an export trade; and that if a gold standard was established India could not hereafter compete with the silver-using countries who export commodities similar to those which India produces. I am glad to say I think the Committee [on Indian currency] have finally and successfully exploded these fallacies.

The very fact that Lord George Hamilton thinks so at once puts one upon enquiry. It is very safe to affirm that 99 out of 100 independent men of business and financial experience and of knowledge of India could be counted on to cast their vote against him.

Lord George Hamilton cited the case of Argentina, which had been "used as a familiar illustration of how a depreciated currency benefited a great exporting country." He argued that the eventual large export of Argentina was not a consequence of the depreciation of Argentine money, but a "result of the previous outlay." No doubt it was so in part; but he failed entirely to show that the low currency did not prove a good thing for the people of the country, and therefore he proved nothing but his own capacity to turn an argument with specious glibness. We should advise him to turn to Mr. Acting-Consul Biorklund's "Report on the Trade and Commerce of Mexico for the year 1898," which has only just been issued from the dilatory Foreign Office. Mr. Biorklund sets forth the figures of imports and exports and fluctuations of currency, with which we need not trouble ourselves here and now, and then he pens the following paragraph:—

> Mexico, being on a silver basis, has to remit gold abroad for the service of the public debt, as well as for the interest due to the holders of stock and bonds of the different railway companies. These payments fluctuate to such an extent with the rise and fall of silver that it is impossible to say how much she may have to remit. From the foregoing figures, however, it is shown that in spite of the fall of silver, and the consequent variation in the rate of exchange, from 3s. 9½d. in the year 1890 (August), the highest point it has reached since 1881, to the lowest point 1s. 8⅝d. in September, 1897, the commercial standing of the country has been steadily improving, and she is now in a position to expect that the rise in silver together with an increase in her commercial and industrial enterprises will enable her to cancel her obligations with far less trouble, and will at the same time be able to offer a wider and surer field than heretofore for the investment of foreign capital.

The fluctuations of exchange have never tossed India up and down to such an extent as this; yet, in spite of the deplorable depreciation of the dollar, Mexico's commercial standing "has been steadily improving," her commercial and industrial enterprises steadily increasing. The contrast with the position of India may well invite a statesman to pause and think a bit.

Argentina and Mexico have both borrowed largely, the former most recklessly. But has not India borrowed as well—both largely and recklessly? If it is the earlier borrowings that have fructified in Argentina to such an extent as to found prosperity with some vague prospect of ultimate clearance, why is it that a like result has not followed a like course in India? Even the strongest supporters of the Government among the Anglo-Indian journals fail to find sufficiently strong words of reprobation of Lord George Hamilton's jubilation over his surplus. The *Pioneer* cannot bring itself to believe that Reuter has reported him accurately. How, then, can the prosperity of India—the prosperity of the masses of the people—be said to be in any way assured? How can one rationally accept the view that the previous loans have fructified and are now going to issue in financial relief? Mexico has not rushed to a gold standard to remedy its financial weakness, even under pressure of a much lower dollar than the Indian rupee; and yet, somehow, Mexico is rising steadily out of her difficulties. How is this? The facts must have some bearing upon the case of India. The people of Mexico are able to rise to prosperity with a frightfully depreciated dollar; the less depreciated rupee of India drives her Government in a panic to a remedy for a state of things that does not seem to inconvenience the Mexicans, but actually is concomitant with a condition of commercial and industrial improvement and successful enterprise. There must be some lesson here for the misguided Government of India.

The contention that the low rupee was good for the rayat though bad for the Government, Lord George Hamilton thinks, has been overturned by the Currency Committee. The low rupee was bad for the Government only because the Government had run up such a heavy sterling bill in London. The natural remedy, every sane man would think, would have been to cut down the London expenses. That was the course pointed to by the interests of the country—the interests of the taxpayers, on whom it was incumbent to provide the money. But that course was not open to the Government, because involving a confession of mistaken policy, which would not be made except in the last extremity, and then under cover of some conspicuous public advantage redounding to the glory of officialdom. But the low rupee was good for the rayat or taxpayer generally, though Lord George Hamilton and his advisers think otherwise, and imagine that the Currency Committee has proved otherwise. The point of the whole matter is brought out with penetrating satire by Mr. David Yule, in his recent speech to the shareholders of the Bank of Calcutta, which we reprinted a fortnight ago (INDIA, Aug. 25, p. 101):—

> The majority of the Committee have been unable to grasp the truth that the prosperity of the people and of the Government's commercial undertakings, such as railways and irrigation works, had increased in spite of the decline in the exchange value of the rupee. The problem of what the state of matters might be when the rupee was worth nothing at all raised their apprehensions; but, the subject being beyond the mental range of the witnesses who had brought it forward as an argument against the reopening of the mints, no conclusion was arrived at. In view of the almost unanimous opinion of the Government witnesses that the artificial and enhanced value of the rupee had not interfered with trade or constituted a tax on the people, it is unfortunate that the Committee did not enquire who were paying the Secretary of State sixteenpence for rupees which cost the Government of India only tenpence. It would have been found that the purchasers were not Americans or Australians or Africans, but the Government of India's own subjects; and, if it be not a tax on producers to be forced to pay sixteenpence for the rupees which represent

the balance of profits on their exports, the word has no meaning, and another is required which will signify the loss producers sustain and the profit which goes into the Government's pocket.

Over and over again, capable and experienced men of business testified to the Committee that the low rupee favoured, and the artificially heightened rupee checked, the expansion of cultivation and production and industrial enterprise, and therewith the hopes and courage of the producers. To stickle at the absurd supposition that the rupee would become as unsaleable as old iron was a feat worthy of the Committee, where it might have found a very obvious answer, if not from the witnesses on the spur of the moment. In any case, the rupee could not have gone down to zero by the run; and, if it did, where would our own shillings and pence be? The lift may fall and smother the larks, but there is no particular apprehension of any such calamity. But, though the taxpayer might easily have waited to see, the Government could not; and therefore it was necessary to discover that the interests of the taxpayer coincided with the interests of the Government. It is a humiliating comparison with President Diaz and his prosperous Mexicans.

At the time when the mints were closed by way of first step towards the establishment of a gold standard, the trade and industries of India were rapidly expanding, in spite of the low rupee and the extravagance of the Government. "From 1860 to 1873, about the time when the currency depreciated," said Sir Antony MacDonnell in his evidence before the Currency Committee (5721-22), "there was considerable oscillation in prices; from 1873 to 1885, there was less oscillation. The tendency was generally upwards, but the variations were marked. Prices steadied from 1885 till the mints were closed in 1893. There was a great stability in prices with a tendency upwards." And again (5,774): "Apart from the dislocation caused by the famine and bad seasons, the purchasing power of the rupee has remained pretty steady. There have been local variations, of course, owing to the scarcity and so on; but apart from these the purchasing power of the rupee has remained steady from the middle of 1886 to the middle of 1893." That is to say, as Mr. David Cruickshank points out (9,391), "the purchasing power of the rupee had not fallen up to the time of the closing of the mints; or, in other words, the rupee had not depreciated in value in relation to commodities in India." Now let us cite Mr. David Yule again. In his annual address to the shareholders of the Bank of Calcutta last year (INDIA, vol. x., p. 135), he said this:

What cheap silver has done for India may be gathered from a review of the fifteen years 1878 to 1893, and from it we may also judge whether Lord Herschell's Indian Committee were justified in supposing that India stood in any danger of bankruptcy, or that there was any occasion for seeking to give assistance to the Indian Budget by closing the mints, and thereby making the ultimate maintenance of the Indian Empire by England only a matter of time. Reckoning as ordinary expenditure everything except the cost of the greater wars, of the special defences for the North-West Frontier and the coast, of actual famine relief and of railway construction, so far as met out of revenue, the result was a balance of revenue over the ordinary expenditure of Rs. 412,000,000. During that time the total army had been increased from 170,000 to 220,000 men, and the number of British soldiers from 60,000 to 71,000, the outlay on this account alone being a severe drain on the revenue. In addition to this, nearly all the public buildings have been reconstructed on a scale of magnificence, judging from the examples we have in Calcutta. It must be remembered, too, that throughout the fifteen years there had been a gradual yearly decline in the average gold value of the rupee—from 20¾d. in 1877 to 15d. in 1892. In my opinion, the Government of India should have continued to place trust in the ability of the people to manage their business in such a way that, in spite of the fall in silver, the revenue would be more than sufficient to meet the expenditure. The Budget could be in no danger so long as the trade and industries of the country were expanding, as they were rapidly doing at the time when the mints were closed. Further, there was every indication that the benefit of cheap silver to the community would continue to far more than compensate for the fall in the gold value of the rupee. As a matter of fact, India was ripe for a very heavy increase in her currency requirements, and surely it was much more profitable for the country to employ silver at a low price than silver at a high price for this purpose.

The woeful results of the artificial creation of a high rupee we have already on several occasions set forth in considerable detail. They are effectively expounded in Mr. D. E. Wacha's speech on the currency resolution passed by the Eighth Indian National Congress at Allahabad in December, 1892. Lord George Hamilton will probably not condescend to consider Mr. Wacha's arguments. But even he can hardly affect to despise, though he may conveniently ignore, the experience and knowledge of the chairman of the Bank of Calcutta.

THE CALCUTTA MUNICIPAL BILL.

A PRACTICAL PROTEST.

TWENTY-EIGHT ELECTED COMMISSIONERS RESIGN.

"PROFOUND SENSATION" IN CALCUTTA.

[BY CABLE, FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

CALCUTTA, *September* 3.

Twenty-eight elected Commissioners of the Corporation of Calcutta, including all the prominent and most experienced men, have resigned their seats on the Council as a protest against the Municipal Bill and the Bengal Government's discourteous reply to the Corporation's motion soliciting information regarding the existence of corrupt politicians among the elected Commissioners. The resignations have created a profound sensation among the Indian community.—*By Eastern Telegraph.*

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

BOMBAY, August 19.

Lord Curzon, enthusiastic and energetic as he is, has issued his third important manifesto this week. It is all about the construction of railways during the next three years. There is the practice to hold once every two or three years a meeting of all the important representatives of Indian railway companies. This meeting has hitherto been dignified by the name of a conference. The conference is now sitting, presided over by the Viceroy himself. On the opening day, however, Lord Curzon made a speech in which he declared that it was his intention to take the public into the confidence of the Government in matters of railways. He did not see why promoters of railway enterprises as well as the public, who are the ultimate payers of all railways, should not know something of the movements and intentions of the Railway Public Works Department. This is indeed a move in the right direction. As such it has been universally approved. Hitherto the conference met in secret, deliberated in secret, and resolved in secret. The public were only informed of the bare resolutions. This procedure is now given the go-by. There is to be enough publicity. For this mercy many thanks. How long, however, this new procedure may last is problematical. That it will last Lord Curzon's Viceroyalty may be taken for granted. But it is a question whether his successor will continue it. It will all depend on the strength of character of the person sitting on the Viceregal *musnud.*

For our own experience is this. While Viceroys come and go, the bureaucracy is a permanent institution. Whenever any Viceroy attempts by sheer force of character to deprive it of some of its cherished powers, it uniformly resents the deprivation. It keeps a sullen silence so long as the reforming authority is in power; though it leaves no stone unturned, by virtue of a kind of unwritten law or conspiracy, to thwart the will of the Viceroy in divers secret ways. But the moment the exalted authority lays down the reins of his office, then the secret undermining process undergoes a change. There is an open reversion to the old practice. Of course, they first watch what kind of a personage is the new Viceroy. If he be such a namby-pamby individual as Lord Lansdowne or Lord Elgin, they soon feel their power and from that time forward begin to re-assert their will. It is notorious the way in which the bureaucracy accepted the statesmanlike measure of Local Self-Government inaugurated by the sympathetic and far-seeing Lord Ripon. But it was a dagger to the permanent officialdom of the land. From that moment forward they tried to undermine it in a variety of ways. The Bombay Government, then ruled by Mr. Lionel Ashburner, with the weak Sir James Fergusson at its head, openly refused to carry out the project. The Imperial circular was set at defiance till they were sharply reminded of their duty. Similarly all through the country the collectors looked askance at the boon. Their accredited organs of public opinion inveighed in no measured terms against it. It was talked of contemptuously. But Nemesis was against the service which loves to call itself distinguished, and the measure throve in spite of its most hostile opposition. One need not be surprised if almost all reforming measures like this one on railways and the other on secretariats be buried in oblivion the moment Lord Curzon's back is turned.

But we see nothing specially to commend in this departmental committee or conference. If the public are to be taken into confidence, then Lord Curzon should go a step further, and invite a representative from each Presidency and Province to confer with the railway authorities on the grievances of the

public. There has been, for instance, a hue and cry for a long time against all the railway companies on account of the very rude, nay insolent, treatment offered to Native passengers, especially of the third class. It is notorious that their comforts are never attended to. They are treated like a herd of sheep. The way in which they are packed in third class compartments is simply discreditable. Their complaints are never heard. In fact, it is no exaggeration to affirm that the companies have a single eye to the earnings which the coaching in third class yield, and care not a straw for the comfort and convenience of the humble travellers, which is left to the chapter of accidents. Appeals after appeals and memorials after memorials have been presented time out of mind to the Imperial Government, but with little effect. No doubt some grievances have been removed, but many more still remain unredressed. There are yards of resolutions and reminders to the purse-proud companies, who simply put them in the waste paper basket.

This part of the affair, however, is insignificant compared with the important matters to which the attention of the Departmental Committee is to be drawn. There are 135 projects to be considered. And it is reported that something like twenty-five crores will be spent during the next three years on such of the railways as the Committee may now determine. The Viceroy tells the public that the original intention was to spend twenty-nine crores, so that the programme is partly abridged; that it is really burdensome to construct railways with railway speed at the rate of over eight crores a year. Railways have been declared on all hands to be no such unmixed blessing as Lord George Hamilton and his apologists may say in the House of Commons. A calm and deliberate survey of the financial results of the State railways shows that, save two or three, none has yet paid its way. They have all incurred heavy losses amounting to about thirty-five crores of rupees in thirty years —say, at the rate of over a crore a year. While this is the true financial position of the State railways, the authorities are intent on rushing through many more, regardless of the burden of the annual interest charged on the sterling loans to be borrowed for the purpose. Will the new gold currency be able to stem the further tide of deficits which increasing sterling charges may entail on this country?

But look at the irony of fate! While they are deliberating on more extended construction, famine is again hanging over a greater portion of the peninsula. How much more might the country benefit by extended irrigation works, which not only pay, but do not demand such a heavy sacrifice of capital outlay as the non-paying railways. But such is the short-sighted statesmanship which has the destiny of the country in its hands that, while they neglect irrigation works on a large scale all over the country which would banish famine from the land, they blindfoldedly and with a light heart rush through ambitious railway schemes of doubtful utility costing crores! This is the statesmanship which administers India! When may we expect a wiser and more economic policy? Lord Curzon seems determined to signalise his Viceroyalty by achieving miracles. But he is greatly mistaken if he fancies that these can be achieved by means such as he is now taking in connexion with railways. Lord Curzon, however, is ambitious and enthusiastic, and it remains to be seen in what slough his ambition and enthusiasm may eventually plunge him.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AND "*INDIA.*"

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS IN INDIA.

The "Champion."

Is it superfluous to say that these denunciations are but the outcome of baffled impotence and rage? If anything, these repeated attacks on Sir William Wedderburn, and through him on the Congress, show the incapability of making any serious defence in reference to the allegations made concerning the administration here. The tactics are those of the vulgar attorney who abuses for lack of honest defence. Moreover, such attacks, it is needless to say, defeat their own object. Lord George Hamilton and those who are behind him are egregiously mistaken if they think that the epithets that have been hurled at Sir William Wedderburn will even by a hair's breadth turn away that gentle and most noble-minded Englishman from his purpose of trying to right the many grievous wrongs of India. Where "gross falsehoods" are to be found is notorious, and it is not for us to inform the intelligent reader where to look for them. But one thing we must observe in this place. It is time that all India indignantly protested against the intemperate and unparliamentary language which Reuter has ascribed to Lord George Hamilton. This is the second time that Sir William has been foully attacked. And it would be a discredit to the Indian public if they did not bestir themselves, and pay back Lord George in his own coin. Let India with one voice tell England whom she most respects and regards with unbounded confidence for all the self-sacrifice and all the disinterested service he has rendered to her, despite ridicule, obloquy, and abuse. We are quite sure that India's deep and abiding sympathy for Sir William will be a source of the greatest comfort to him, and that he will know how beneath his notice are the vile accusations hurled at him by a Secretary of State whose knowledge of India is rudimentary and who has been admitted on all hands to be the most incompetent person who has ever held the reins of Indian administration at Westminster. (August 13.)

The "Englishman."

Lord George Hamilton never minces his words. He is a politician with clear-cut, definite views. He denies to his opponents the possession of a single scrap of loyalty, or patriotism, or even commonsense. It is not surprising, therefore, to read in Reuter's message that during the debate on the Indian Budget he violently attacked Sir William Wedderburn. . . . . He sees what Sir William Wedderburn does not, that liberty is liable to degenerate into license and excess where there are no safeguards such as exist in England. . . . . Sir William Wedderburn and his coadjutors may have the best intentions in the world, but can they not see that India is not the country in which to try political experiments? Of course, we do not for a moment suggest that any member of Parliament would wilfully pervert facts, but the adjective false may also be applied to moral ideas and principles, and it was doubtless in this connexion that Lord George Hamilton used the word. The paper India certainly is not more violent or inaccurate in its language than any other party organ at home. Its especially mischievous nature is to be found rather in the fact that it is addressed to Natives of India who have not the same restraint, or the reasons for restraint, as the people of England. It must not be supposed that we have no sympathy with the ambitions of educated Indians to take a larger share in the Government of their country, but they must not expect Englishmen to listen to claims based on the supposition that the existing administration is corrupt and ignoble. (Aug. 11).

[The *Englishman*, not having before it the specific case adduced by Lord George Hamilton, is driven to seek grounds of its own in mere speculation.—Ed. India.]

The "Hindu."

We should have thought that most even of those who differed from Sir William Wedderburn on Indian questions would condemn the outrageous language that Lord George Hamilton thought fit to hold towards that great friend of India during the House of Commons debate on the Indian Budget. But the *Englishman* is not, as most honest critics, generous and just to an opponent. . . . "You must not smoke in powder magazines," says our contemporary in this connexion. "You must not discharge a gun into the street." Certainly not. But what right has one to take it for granted that India is a powder magazine where smoking ought to be prohibited, or a street in which firearms ought not to be allowed to be let off? How can one be sure that the average Indian, being an illiterate creature and as such incapable of appreciating constitutional methods, can only "enforce arguments with physical violence"? Where is the reason for supposing that immediately he is told by papers like India that the Indian administration is not perfect he will rise and try to overthrow it by force? We do not know if he ever reads the papers. But if he has read them all these years and not tried anywise to "enforce arguments with physical violence" what need to fear that he is capable of doing so? . . . Our contemporary continues: "Sir William Wedderburn and his coadjutors may have the best intentions in the world, but can they not see that India is not the country in which to try political experiments?" The question might with equal reason have been asked about the British Government in India. For what have they been doing in India, these many decades, but "trying political experiments"? . . . . Sir William Wedderburn will survive these and many more attacks of this kind, and any impartial man is not the least likely to think any the worse of him because Lord George Hamilton so entirely forgets his own position and the requirements of common courtesy. We can hardly call to mind any occasion on which Lord George Hamilton has spoken one word of sympathy, one word of encouragement, towards the people of India; and sobriety in denunciation has never been a virtue with him in dealing with public opinion in this country. (August 17.)

The "Mahratta."

We are not aware of any falsehoods, much less "gross falsehoods," circulated in India; nor do we know how Sir William Wedderburn can be held responsible supposing any have really been circulated. But those who are in the enjoyment of power may neglect or even murder truth and logic with immunity. We know the honest Scotch baronet has been a *bête noir* with the official party of Anglo-Indians in England, and fulminations such as the present are not the first of their kind to be directed against him. But he has survived them all and will survive also many more. Sir William has at any rate, we are sure, the sound satisfaction of having done his best to awaken the conscience of the country from time to time. The keepers of the national conscience are not to be numbered by hundreds in any country. Posterity at any rate will do him the justice which his enemies are denying him, and will cherish his name just as it has been doing those of Burke, Fawcett and Bradlaugh. (August 13.)

The Lahore "Tribune."

Lord George Hamilton's attack on Sir William Wedderburn is another illustration of the change which is coming over the spirit of British statesmanship. Bluff and bluster are taking the place of calm reasoning and impartial judgment. This we see in every direction. Sir William Wedderburn, after spending his best years in the service of India, has not, like most of his brother ex-officials, devoted his energies to (in the words of the Native proverb) soiling the plate off which he had been eating all his life. Like the true Briton that he is, he could not look quietly on while, at every step the authorities out here took, it was becoming evident that the old ideals of government were being forsaken fast, for the sake of the fetish of prestige, and for making the educated Native know his place. Our countrymen will now see once more that, in the eyes of our rulers, or in other words of their chief, those Englishmen who have consecrated their lives to the work of freeing the administration of India of its abuses are the stirrers up of bad feeling against the Indian Government! (August 12.)

THE "INDIAN BUDGET" DEBATE.

MORE OPINIONS OF THE PRESS IN INDIA.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S OPTIMISM.

THE "PIONEER."

When people have agreed to consider heavy taxation as a proof of prosperity, then we shall be able to fall into line with Lord George Hamilton's argument in his speech on the Indian Budget that the financial situation in India is satisfactory because the surplus last year was the biggest on record. As it is, the fact that more money was taken from the country than ever before would not seem in itself to be any particular matter for congratulation. No doubt the situation is better than if the same amount of money had been raised without producing a surplus; but that is all the length to which the Government can expect the satisfaction of the public to go. What the taxpayer sees is that emergency taxes, allowed to be objectionable, and imposed as temporary, still remain in the system with every appearance of becoming permanencies; and to be told under these circumstances that a big surplus is a sign for congratulation and that it disproves the idea that India is being bled to death is in the nature of an aggravation rather than of an argument. We do not of course go with Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in the "bleeding to death" theory; but it is obvious that to point to the fact that the Government is continually raising more money out of the country (a fact of which we are all conscious) is not necessarily a refutation of that theory. Probably Lord George Hamilton's speech has suffered in the process of condensation. His lordship's robust optimism has led him into a good many questionable arguments before this, but we can hardly fancy him to have talked the nonsense pure and simple that the report would represent him to have talked. (August 18.)

THE "CHAMPION."

To talk of the prosperity of the Indian people, when all around us the deepest anxiety is felt for the future of the crops, owing to a lack of the much-needed rain, is simply fatuous. . . . To Lord G. Hamilton it was a miracle—that surplus of over 4 crores—for never before in the history of British rule was there achieved such a magnificent excess of receipts ever expenditure. Deluded Secretary of State! Why, any permanent clerk in the Finance Department could have told him that it was no surplus but a windfall. In fact, there *never* has been in all British Indian history such a thing as a *true* surplus in India, as Sir John Strachey and Sir Evelyn Baring (Lord Cromer) observed years ago. There was no miracle about this windfall of 4 crores. But, admitting that there was this windfall, how does that fact prove the prosperity of the people? Now what are the real facts as to surplus and deficit in India? This only, that taking the last 50 years, there has been an *annual* deficit of over *half a crore*, in spite of the heaviest taxation. This is no romance. There are the State records to prove it. They are public property, and any one inclined to sift the truth may find it out for himself. As to prosperity, only the other day Sir James Lyall and his colleagues told Parliament in their report on the last famine, that the masses, the lowest classes of the population who live on insufficient food, are worse off than they were in 1878-9. Lord Dufferin, writing ten years later, in 1888-89 observed in his despatch that their condition was a cause of grave anxiety. That anxiety, says the Lyall Commission, has been aggravated by the last famine, and will be more so in the future. And yet we are asked to believe in the growing prosperity of the country. We are aware of the "courtier" class in the Press who endorse the Secretary of State's romance about India, but that in no way alters the reality of the situation. (August 18.)

THE "HINDU."

We are not sure that there will be many in India who will acquiesce in the extravagant optimism of Lord George Hamilton, for it has been recognised even by Lord Curzon that the prosperity indicated by the last Budget is but an accidental circumstance which may be reversed by any of those unforeseen reverses to which this country is always liable. The Government of India have been led to various devices to meet their daily increasing charges; various new taxes have been imposed, new debts have been incurred, but so far the Government have not found their way to abolish or reduce a single tax or to diminish their sterling debts. The people go on paying more taxes; the Government go on borrowing more money in gold; and Lord George Hamilton imagines that all these are neutralised by the apparent prosperity of one year. What surplus there has been in this one year has not been utilised, nor is it likely to be utilised, for the relief of the people, nor for the promotion of many needful reforms in the administration of the country, but is to be diverted towards the purpose of establishing a gold standard, which, to say the least, is a questionable advantage to the people of India. Lord George Hamilton's enthusiasm over the last Budget would have been more appropriate if he had found it possible to remove one single burden from off our shoulders, but it is sad to note that at the time that he is talking in this high style India is very nearly threatened with another famine. Any country in which a single failure of the season is sufficient to reduce the mass of the people to the point of starvation and misery cannot be said to be a prosperous country; and if this be the test of prosperity, Lord George Hamilton has little reason to think that the millenium has come for India because the last Budget showed the largest surplus since India came under British rule. (August 17.)

THE "MAHRATTA."

With Lord George Hamilton we are of course looking forward to the dawning of the exceptional prosperity, but in the meanwhile we must contest his view that a surplus in one year's Indian finance is a sure index of the prosperity of the country, with a description of which the State Secretary tried to conjure up the minds of the House of Commons. If only one year of surplus can warrant us in describing the state of the country as prosperous, another single year of deficit ought equally to warrant us in describing the financial condition of the British Government in India as one of insolvency or bankruptcy. The so-called surplus more or less represents the savings on account of a better exchange. That means only an accident, and no self-respecting financiers would we think allow credit to be given to them for a result brought about by a mere accident of that kind. If the current of exchange, which of course is uncontrollable, had gone just the other way the State Secretary would not have had reason to be so jubilant. What we want to point out is that the claim of good financing urged by the State Secretary on behalf of the Indian Government is not based on either any reduction of taxation or any substantial economy in expenditure. Till that is accomplished it would be difficult for a sensible man to join his voice with that of the State Secretary. In the meanwhile the sprinkling of rose-water upon the conscience of Parliament is going on, and it will of course go on till we bestir ourselves and relieve the State Secretary and his band of Anglo-Indian officials of their self-imposed task of spreading the light of knowledge about India in England. (August 13.)

THE "INDIAN SPECTATOR."

Lord George Hamilton might regard the surplus of a single year, taken by itself, as disproving theories regarding the economic effects of British rule in India, which are the reverse of complimentary to it. But if a single surplus can prove so much, what may not many successive deficits be held to prove? It is not a great thing for a surplus to be the largest surplus since India came under British rule, because there have been very few surpluses, we fancy, since that time. It almost seems sacrilegious that the Secretary of State for India should be indulging in high-flown sentiments about results exceeding the most sanguine expectations, when the situation in the country is such as to cause the gravest anxiety. "If normal weather occurs next year," Lord George Hamilton thought, "a period of exceptional prosperity would dawn for India." If it does not, what would be the result? Does his Lordship think that a country which the failure of a single season can hurl down from exceptional prosperity to by no means exceptional adversity is fit object for glorification to rulers or ruled? (August 13.)

THE BOMBAY "SAMACHAR."

The unprecedented surplus is nothing to be thankful for, if it is amassed by refusing adequate aid to Municipalities and District Boards whose resources have been strained to the utmost by expenditure on plague, and by preying upon the Provincial Revenues, at the cost of starving some of the State departments and impeding the progress of useful public works. It is to be regretted that the Secretary of State for India relies too implicitly upon the information and guidance of the permanent officials of the India Office. If Lord George Hamilton were to care to look for himself into the financial position of India, he would probably be cured of his happy delusion as to the state of things in this country.

THE "KAISER-I-HIND."

Even supposing that the rose-coloured expectations of an exceptional surplus will be fulfilled, what grounds are there for believing that that surplus will lead to a period of exceptional prosperity of the people? The last year's surplus was a large one. Yet remission of taxation there was none whatsoever. The local bodies looked up to Government for assistance in carrying out sundry pressing sanitary reforms. But disappointment was all they got. Several works of public utility were deferred without any hesitation. If such is the condition of the people in the years of surpluses, their condition in the years of deficits is not difficult to realise.

THE LAHORE "TRIBUNE."

The Secretary of State's statement suggests questions like the following: (1) Only the year before last the whole country was writhing in the grip of a terrible famine, when Government had to feed thousands on thousands of starving people. What kind of "prosperity" is it which is only one step removed from death from hunger? *Exceptional* prosperity certainly, but not in the sense Lord George Hamilton meant it. (2) There were few parts of the Empire where the authorities were not compelled to grant remissions of revenue, and sometimes make advances to agriculturists. Besides, in some tracts, owing to utter want of fodder, numbers of plough oxen had died; and to replace them money had to be borrowed at a terrible rate of interest. How then, only after one tolerably good year, was so much revenue, including the enormous amount of arrears, realised as to give a record surplus? (3) Even yet not a few districts bear deep traces of the scarcity. In fact, there are areas where but for public relief hundreds would die of starvation. We still daily see hordes of famine-stricken people wandering about the country. Is the state of things so promising, then, as to make one dream of the dawn of "a period of exceptional prosperity"? (August 10.)

AUTOCRATIC RULE FOR INDIA.

"DUBIOUS BENEFITS OF BENEVOLENT DESPOTISM."

SOME "INSUPERABLE OBSTACLES."

In his second and final letter to the *Spectator* (Sept. 2), Professor A. V. Dicey inquires "What is the practical worth of Mr. Morison's policy of Indian Imperialism?" He writes as follows:—

My unhesitating reply as a mere critic, who, without any personal acquaintance with India, regards the whole subject from an English point of view, is that Mr. Morison's conception of Imperialism, grounded on personal loyalty to the Empress, lies entirely outside the

range of practical politics. Its realisation is forbidden not by the conditions of Indian society, for which it may conceivably be well enough adapted, but by the conditions of public life in England, and, indeed, by the whole course and tendency of English history. "Loyalty to the Empress" may mean either of two quite different things—that is to say, either loyalty to the Queen as a constitutional monarch who acts in strict accordance with the customs of English constitutionalism, and therefore in obedience to Parliament; or loyalty to the Queen as a real and true Empress of India, who, acting in accordance with her own will and her own discretion, aided no doubt by competent advisers, can exercise at the lowest as much real power in India as does the German Emperor in Germany, or if her rule is to be really effective, as did the first Napoleon throughout the French empire. Now in whichever of these two senses we employ the term, loyalty to the Queen, it will be found that the policy of Queen-worship is an impossibility.

If by loyalty to Victoria we mean loyalty to the Queen who fulfils with infinite dignity and tact the duties of a Parliamentary Monarch, then we cannot hope to kindle among the people of India the personal enthusiasm for the Empress which Mr. Morison desiderates. The difficulty does not consist in the Queen being a mere figurehead—a monarch who reigns but never governs. This notion of royal powerlessness is a delusion. . . . . The reason why Queen Victoria cannot inspire the personal loyalty evoked by Elizabeth, and retained to a great extent even by Anne, is that the authority of a constitutional ruler is influence rather than direct power, and when at its greatest, is power masked under the forms of the Constitution. In England Queen Victoria must always appear, at least, to be the mouthpiece of Parliament. She cannot at the same moment appear in India to be the autocratic, all-powerful Empress who arouses that combination of fear and of love which makes up loyalty. To preach veneration for the constitutional Queen would further come round to an indirect demand for that loyalty to the English race which, as Mr. Morison rightly maintains, England can never with reason exact, and will never in reality receive, from the people of India. . . . .

"Loyalty to the Queen" [however] means, in his [Mr. Morison's] mouth, loyalty to a ruler who actually and in fact governs India. "I am altogether of the opinion," he writes, "that it would be desirable to make the Queen's nominal right to direct the administration of India a practical right which she should constantly exercise, that it would be desirable that the hand of the Queen be felt in the government." Now if the Crown were given in India the power which the Crown exercised in the time of the Tudors in England, it might be possible to kindle among the people of India a genuine sentiment of personal loyalty to the Empress. Nor is it at all incredible that the existence of such a sentiment might confer benefit upon India. The distance, indeed, which divides London from Calcutta impedes the maintenance of personal relations between the Empress and her subjects. But distance, after all, might add mysterious dignity to the power of the Monarchy. It is also fairly arguable, though assuredly not certain, that the establishment of despotic government in England might be an actual benefit to India. A representative body is a poor Sovereign for races whom it does not represent. But if by the gift of true Imperial authority to the Queen a statesman could evoke the personal loyalty of Hindus and Mahometans he would thereby at once come into conflict with the fundamental principles of English constitutionalism; and for every difficulty which was removed in India a score of perplexities and confusions would be created in England. Power means nothing else than a person's capacity for over-ruling the will of others. If the Empress is to exercise personal authority in India she must, as regards her Indian subjects, be able to neglect and overrule the will of her Parliamentary Ministers—that is, in the long run of the English people—and this she would have to do while living in England and acting as the constitutional head of the British Empire. Her position would become impossible to maintain. The Queen cannot be throughout the United Kingdom, and, indeed, throughout every part but one of the British Empire, a constitutional monarch who influences but defers to the wishes of her Parliamentary Ministers, and at the same moment be in India an autocratic Empress who treats her Ministers with no more deference than Queen Elizabeth in the sixteenth century paid to the wishes of the servants of the Crown. Mr. Morison perceives the obstacle to his policy presented by the maxims of the British Constitution. He expresses a vague hope that "a generous desire to free our Indian subjects from the humiliation of a foreign yoke might lead by a very passable logic to the alternative of either shuffling off the responsibility of governing India or of submitting ourselves to a form of government which will not be degrading to them." The last of these alternative aspirations is doomed to disappointment. Englishmen will never surrender for themselves and their children the hard-won liberties of England for the sake of conferring upon Mahometans and Hindus the dubious benefits of benevolent despotism. Her Majesty cannot, from the nature of things, be, in truth, in India a benevolent autocrat, and in England a constitutional monarch. We cannot base our Indian administration on personal loyalty to the Empress. We cannot (as I heard it expressed) "boom" the Crown.

Mr. Morison's method for giving effect to his ideas—namely, the creation of loyalty by the fostering of Queen-worship—is impracticable, but his exposition of the principles proper to the government of dependencies has in itself a high value. It sets his readers a-thinking; it forces every man interested in the conduct of public affairs to consider questions we are all prone to overlook. What should be the ultimate end of our Indian administration? Grant that it must be the good of the people of India, what are the means by which this end should be attained? Can we hope in the course of time, however long, to transplant to India English political conceptions? Ought we, for the sake of India herself, to increase or to diminish the personal and autocratic element in the government of the country? Is there any substantial truth in Mr. Morison's contention that Monarchy, rather than any form of Parliamentary rule, is the form of government which alone can enlist the loyalty of an Eastern people? Is it conceivable that at some still remote date a place for a subordinate Monarchy might be found within that British Empire which already embraces, under the name of self-governing Colonies, subordinate Republics? Can any part of England's Eastern dominions be ever made in any sense the home of Englishmen, or, as most of us assume, do the physical laws of Nature decree that as long as India remains part of the British Empire she must be governed by men who, however high their virtues and however great their talent, can be nothing more than transitory residents in the country which they rule? These and a score of other enquiries are raised more or less directly by Mr. Morison's fascinating little treatise. Some of them can receive their reply only from the course of events; none of them can be answered by English critics who, like myself, have no knowledge of Eastern countries. My only contention, which I fancy few will dispute, is that it is well they should be raised. There is a real peril that Englishmen, who are after all responsible for the government of India, should never think out the problems of Indian administration, or rather, never realise their existence. Books like Mr. Morison's break in upon the dreams of ignorant optimism, and thus indirectly guard us against the ruin brought on States as powerful as England by the insidious disease of administrative routine.

Professor Dicey's first letter (August 26) consisted substantially of a restatement of Mr. Morison's main points. The chief views he incidentally expressed may be gathered from the first paragraph of the following editorial comments in the *Spectator* of September 2:—

Though we should admit Mr. Morison's grand premiss, we are quite unable to accept the conclusions about which Professor Dicey invites discussion. He has evidently been struck, as all thoughtful observers of the Indian Empire have been struck, by the want of base for British power other than the British bayonet. The body of the people, the three hundred and odd millions of workers, acquiesce in British rule, and, as was repeatedly shown during the great Mutiny, approve its broad general laws; but they do not like us, and are nowhere genuinely loyal. That is to say, no tribe or district, not even Bengal, would be sure to rise in arms to defend us against a revolution intended to end in our expulsion. The Sikhs did it in 1857, but we fear their motive was partly reverence for "Jan Sahib" and partly their hereditary feud with Delhi. This, as Professor Dicey sees, is the weak place in our system of Indian government, and he asks if it could not be corrected by developing national feeling in India, and infusing into it a spirit of personal loyalty towards the Empress. If it could—and personally he professes no opinion—he would carefully and gradually, but still decidedly, increase the autocratic power, or, to use a pleasanter expression, the personal power of the monarch, especially as regards the right of selecting men, European or Indian, for high office in the Empire. He might even, as we understand him—though he expressly repudiates conviction, and clearly only raises the point as one worthy at least of discussion—look forward to a day when India should be a separate though subordinate monarchy, governed by a representative of the monarch appointed for life or even hereditary, and supported by an English colony settled in the extreme north. It should, that is, be very much in the position of Brazil before the royal family emigrated to that great dependency.

The idea thus tentatively suggested as the outcome of Mr. Morison's proposals will not work. It is exceedingly doubtful, to begin with, whether India can be made a nation. It is at present a vast continent containing many nations violently divided from each other by race, language, and degree of civilisation, and by two dominant creeds which just tolerate each other, but are radically opposed in theology, philosophy, and ultimate ideals of life. That it can be governed as a whole is certain, for the Timour family did so govern it for three hundred years, and we so govern it now, though—a fact too often forgotten—through what is really a strongly knit, though informal, federal system. Bengal practically never even hears of the internal government of Madras or Bombay. That there is a certain Indian solidarity of feeling, as there is a certain solidarity of feeling in Europe, is true, but the sentiment no more produces national unity there than it does here. That the races of the secluded peninsula, shut in by the sea and the eternal wall of the Himalaya from the rest of mankind, consider the "rest" all foreign may be admitted, but they quarrel among themselves like Frenchmen and Germans or Protestants and Catholics, without much deference to a general sense which nevertheless exists. A Sikh will cut down a Mahratta, or order a Bengalee to turn out his hoards, with a very clear sense that he is not killing or pillaging a compatriot. Nor does the Indian love autocracy for itself enough to produce true loyalty. The Mogul emperors were autocratic enough in all conscience, and were many of them really great men—we should rank Akbar, for instance, with Marcus Aurelius or Charlemagne—but they were perpetually resisted—the Rajpoot chiefs, for instance, were never more "loyal" to Delhi than Charles the Bold to Louis XI—and their power ultimately perished through the continuous disloyalty of their great vassals or agents. The Princes, almost without exception, stood by us in 1857, out of dread of a revival of the Mogul power. The Indian prefers no doubt, like every other Asiastic, personal rule to a *régime* of law, which he thinks "leaden," but he is by no means remarkable for loyalty, constantly intrigues against his master, and has a distinct proclivity towards setting up for himself. Holkar and Scindia may respect the house of Sivajee, but respect does not mean loyalty. Outside Rajpootana and Travancore no Indian's birth has ever prevented his seizing the throne, and the "Princes" we now talk so much about are in the immense majority of cases quite new men, new as the Bernadottes or Obrenovitches.

There are two other obstacles, at least, to the development of personal sway as a means of creating loyalty which seem to us insuperable. It is the fixed idea of every Indian, whether noble or peasant, Mahometan or Hindu, that the right of a personal ruler to rule depends on his power and willingness to redress instantly and by fiat any wrong brought before him. He is to remit this tax when it falls on the ruined man, to restore that estate wrongfully held, to

execute by personal order the violent oppressor, to promote suddenly and dramatically the good servant of the State or benefactor of the people. "To protect the good, to dominate the bad, is the Mahárájáh's first duty," is the motto which every man accepts. Has an English king the power of doing this, or can we give him the power, which of necessity must override all laws, all modes of procedure, and all established customs? It is simply impossible, and being impossible, so also is the development in India of any true "loyalty" in the English sense, which again would never be felt for a Sovereign who could not by a breath make a peasant a Prime Minister. That is the strength, and to an Asiatic the charm, of the absolute throne. The Sovereign sees mischief rampant, feels his inability to cope with it, stoops amid the crowd and snatches up, be it Kiuprili the renegade, or Mehemet Ali the tobacconist, or Hyder Ali the lance-corporal, or Todah Mull the banker's clerk, and says "Take absolute power," and if he has chosen the right man all again is smooth. A civilised Sovereign cannot do that, first because he cannot delegate power enough, secondly because he at once disorganises the services, which become nests of jobbery and intrigue. We have to use an elaborate system to prevent abuses of patronage in England, and in India, where watchfulness is nearly impossible and there is no Parliament, they would in no long period shake the State. The "Simla group!" is dangerous enough, but imagine the Simla group with an autocrat in its hands! India would be as Russia, with this aggravation, that the Russian autocrat can send an evil Secretary of State to Siberia, and an English autocrat could not.

Is it then impossible to rest English power in India upon some basis broader than the English bayonet? It is, we believe, impossible to rest it on any general basis—except indeed so far as it rests now upon the very broad one, the universal acquiescence of the peasantry—but a narrow yet rocky foothold may in time be obtained. It may be possible to secure, not indeed the "loyalty," for that implies affection, but the unshakeable fidelity of one of the Indian fighting races, and thus place ourselves beyond even the possibility of a successful insurrection. If the whole population of the Punjab or of Rajpootana or of Mysore could be so conciliated, say by exemption from taxation, that they would give us a conscription and make it a caste rule that every conscript must die by the flag, the British throne in India would be founded, like that of the Hohenzollerns, on a "rock of bronze." The Sikhs, or a great section of them, made that offer to Lord Canning, and we should say that one day, perhaps when Russia seriously threatens invasion or a Chinese army led by Japanese officers pours down through Nepal, the experiment would be tried. It has, however, grave dangers of its own; and for the present we must, we fear, go on as at present; keep a strong garrison in India; keep the real people—the three hundred millions—acquiescent by justice, lenity, and wisely conservative taxation; and wait patiently to see what the purpose of Providence may be in trusting India to us.

BRITISH CAPITAL AND INDIA'S NEEDS.

"NO ADEQUATE INSURANCE FUND."

"EVERYTHING HANGS ON FINANCE."

The *Investors' Review* (September 2) publishes the following letter from "one well entitled to speak":—

As a constant reader of your paper, and one who has spent nearly a quarter of a century of his life in India, I am tempted to write a protest against an opinion which I have seen expressed more than once in the pages of the *Investors' Review*, and which is repeated in to-day's issue. At the end of the paragraph headed "Lord Curzon's New Departures" you say: "As for Native capital it is beyond our reach, so little are we loved and trusted." This is scarcely fair to the Indian Government and its officials, nor do I think it is correct.

There are many reasons for the non-investment of Native capital in Government securities, railways, and other enterprises controlled by Englishmen.

First of all is the backward condition of the Natives. People in England do not realise how little our attempts at education have as yet influenced the mass of the people in India. It may seem to us a very simple matter to place our money in a bank and have it invested in this and that security, but we can write instructions to our banker. Nine-tenths of the Natives of India could not write the simplest business letter. Professional letter writers are employed to write their private letters and petitions. Most men are unwilling to risk their money in concerns of which they have no knowledge. The financial working of a railway is no more comprehensible to a Native than electricity. He likes to feel that he can take up his money at a moment's notice. From time immemorial it has been his custom to melt up his spare money to be worn about the persons of himself, his wife, and children in the shape of anklets, bracelets, etc., which can readily be changed for rupees.

Most of the houses in India are owned by Natives. This *is* a very favourite and profitable form of investment. If we were to leave the country the houses would be valueless. Hindus will not look at 3 per cent. or 4 per cent. interest. They can make 16 per cent. to 50 per cent., and more easily by usury, trade and other means. Native bankers (shroffs) in large cities do buy Government paper and other securities, I believe, but not as investments—only for speculation.

Mahometans have a strong prejudice against putting out their money to interest. They say that it is contrary to the rules of their religion—"usury" was forbidden by Mahomet, but the ordinary Mahometan of India is not sufficiently educated or civilised to understand the difference. The senior Native officer of my regiment—a Mahometan, and now dead—had accumulated a deposit of Rs. 16,000 in the regimental treasure-chest. In vain I told him that he could get 480s. a year if he invested the money in Government paper. He said it was unlawful, but that I could do it if I wished. The money was deposited with other regimental money in the Post-office Savings Bank, and the interest swelled the regimental fund, a fund which afforded assistance in various ways to the Native ranks.

As for the Natives' love for us, it is difficult for men to love those of a dominant and strange race, whose home is not their home. But there are few Natives who do not prefer, and petition that their cases may be tried by, a British and not by a Native magistrate. From the former he feels confident he will obtain justice so far as is in the power of that officer. With the Native magistrate (I am not, of course, speaking of those of high standing, though even these are not always without reproach, as recent prosecutions have shown) the longest purse gains the cause. Over and over again have I been told this by men of my regiment and others. Bribery and corruption are the obstacles in the road of justice in India. They are weeds of many centuries' growth, and cannot be cleared away in one century. Bad as it was under the old Native rulers, with the complex machinery of British rule the number of petty Native officials, all requiring bribes, is multiplied tenfold.

Take the Irrigation Department. A man pays for the water laid on to his fields, but he can never obtain the water without bribing one or more officials. A villager, as a rule, has to pay a postman a small sum before he can get his post-office order cashed; and so it is with every department—the forest keepers, the police, the civil courts.

The future of India is a problem hard to solve; the working out of its salvation is far from completion. Education has affected but a small proportion of the people. The masses retain their old traditions, customs, and prejudices, and the more enlightened few will not sacrifice caste and family ties by striking out in a new path. The ignorance of the women is a dead weight to all progress. Till they can be got at, advance in true civilisation must be very slow.

On this letter the Editor (Mr. A. J. Wilson) comments as follows:—

The letter was not written for publication, and we give, therefore, no clue to the writer's name or position, but trust he will forgive us for putting it before our readers anonymously, because the facts it conveys and the spirit in which it is written fully entitle it to publicity, also because this is really the only effective way in which the "other side" can be presented. Were all Englishmen to guide their conduct in the same spirit, we should never have to complain of want of "love" or esteem on the part of the Indian people towards ourselves. For the rest, it remains the fact that Indians do not habitually invest their money in the enterprises by means of which we have sought to develop their country. It may be, and probably is, mostly the fact that they abstain from giving us their money for the reasons set forth in this letter—ignorance, unfamiliarity with business in the European sense, fidelity, and religious dogma—but whatever the cause, the fact is indisputable, as the records of the Indian Government debt and Indian railway capital prove. It therefore follows that whatever efforts Lord Curzon may make to enlarge the facilities for inter-communication in India or to increase the productive capacity of the land must be made almost altogether with English money, and it is this inconsiderate speed to mortgage the country that we deprecate. The people as a whole cannot be permanently enriched, few of them even temporarily enriched, by developments at 5 per cent. interest provided by foreign capital. What would our own economic position at home be were the capital of our railways provided by France and Germany, compelling us to remit every year some £20,000,000 for interest and dividends? It would be indescribably bad, and what holds good of one country holds equally good of another.

Would we stop developments, then? By no means; but since the Natives, whether from ignorance, habit, or distrust of us, refuse to lend us their savings for the purpose, we should execute public works almost entirely by means of the surplus revenues that would accrue were the country administered with economy and prudence. Indian money would thus be employed in a way calculated to benefit the country for all time, even as some of the great irrigation works carried out by India's early Mahometan rulers have benefited it, and neither Hindu or Mahometan could find the least cause to complain. The people, in short, would be enriched by this mode of development and our power consolidated. It is the ground of all our complaint that this policy has never been followed, that instead of it an unprecedented height of taxation has been reached without benefit to the Natives under our rule, or only the rudimentary benefit of orderly Government. No matter what pretext may have been originally advanced to excuse additional taxation—drooping exchange, famine, exceptional political crises like an Afghan war—the taxes ever put on have never been taken off, and the money they yield has been more

and more fully absorbed each year in purely military directions. The result, unless our Indian informants lie to us, is growing misery and discontent among the people as a whole, and, therefore, increasing instability in our domination.

It stands to reason that it should be so. We have laboured like Trojans or Roman galley slaves to place buffer States and frontier fortifications between us and the dreaded Russian North-West Frontier, and all the time have neglected to protect ourselves against the enemy we may have been creating within our own borders. Our government of India is carried on without adequate insurance fund against disaster, whether moral or monetary. Of what use is it, then, to clamour for ever more British millions to lay out on public works within the Empire? These millions may be undermining that empire. Strengthen it they cannot until the spirit of our administration is so changed that what money we provide shall be as it were hedged round and protected by the great sums annually dusted out of genuine Indian revenue surpluses to similar works of peace and progress. There are several other interesting points in the letter we should like to discuss, such as the proneness of the Natives to corruption, and their well-founded confidence in British justice, but space forbids. And after all everything hangs on finance. Sound, honest, economical administration will consolidate and perpetuate our rule; extravagance will sap and destroy it. To borrow in England in order to cover the ravages of extravagance is but to hasten the end.

BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.

TYRANNICAL OPPRESSION.

OBSTACLES TO EDUCATION.

The *Times of India* (August 19: Weekly Edition) publishes the following noteworthy article—one of a series dealing with the position of British Indians in South Africa—from a Durban correspondent writing under date July 5:—

At present there are about twenty-five schools expressly meant for the education of the children of indentured Indians, attended by nearly 2,000 pupils. Most of these schools are managed by the missionaries, chiefly representing the Church of England Mission, superintended, as to its Indian sections, by the Rev. Dr. Booth, a venerable gentleman very much loved by the Christian portion of the Indian community. These schools receive from the Government a grant by no means adequate for their support. The buildings, as a rule, are of the most primitive type—a few corrugated iron sheets and a few planks of wood composing the material. They are wretchedly constructed, and in country places are devoid even of flooring, mother earth serving the purpose. In one instance a stable has been turned into a school. The pupils, being drawn from the poorest Indians, are naturally not well clad. The tuition imparted is in keeping with the surroundings, the schoolmaster drawing from £2 to £4 a month—in some instances more. The cost of living—I mean decent living—for a person occupying such a position would be, in the case of a careful bachelor, not less than £8. Labour for an Indian affords a better opportunity than the vocation of a teacher; naturally, therefore, the teachers are of a very poor type, though under the circumstances they do their best. The respectable portion, then, of the Indian community, such as clerks, interpreters, storekeepers, and others, do not care to send their children to these schools. Hitherto such as would pay the high fees that are levied here have been able, though by no means without much difficulty, to enter the general public primary schools. An agitation was started some few years ago to prevent any Indian children from gaining entrance into public schools unless they had exhausted the resources of their own schools; and thus an attempt was made to foist the above described Indian schools for the poorest children on the respectable Indians. Since then the difficulties in the way of respectable Indian parents sending their children to the Government schools have been increasing. Now, it is the head master who would put difficulties in their way, and now it is the Government. Latterly, very few Indian children, hardly half-a-dozen, have been able to enter the public primary schools, and that after undergoing immense difficulties.

The present Government, however, have made a big bid for popularity, and have declared their intention of entirely shutting these schools against the Indian children. There is a humorous, if it were not painful, side to this eruption of racial feeling. If an Indian parent has six children, of whom five have received their education in the primary schools, he cannot now give the same education to the last child. If there is a parent ready to disown his Indian nationality he can send his child to the public schools, thus unfortunately for the Government crushing their argument to the effect that the admission of coloured children leads to ill-feeling and uproar. A child born of prostitution, where one parent is European, is admissible. It is the full-blooded Indian alone who has the ban of excommunication stamped upon him. The Government seem to have shrunk from their own unjust action, and as a sop to their conscience, and in order to satisfy the claim of some of the Indian applicants for the admission of their children to the public primary schools, have opened what they are pleased to call a higher grade school for Indian children, which is supposed to be in all respects equal to the above schools. The applicants can hardly be said to have been satisfied; and while the higher grade school is undoubtedly far superior to the wretched tin shanties referred to above, and is manned by a staff of European teachers, it can in no way be said to be equal to the other primary schools in every respect. This school by no means provides for all standards as yet, and the girls are entirely overlooked. Even if it were accepted as a compromise, it leaves many requirements yet unsatisfied. There is absolutely no provision for the Indians to go beyond the three R's. All attempts to gain admission into the high schools of the colony have so far failed, the Government absolutely declining to entertain any such application.

The prospect is indeed very gloomy, unless aid comes in time from Downing Street or Fort William. It is impossible to withhold one's sympathy from parents who are ready to give their whole fortune for a thorough training to their children, and yet who are simply unable to do so owing to the Government restrictions. One Mr. Godfrey, a respected Indian mission schoolmaster, is a case in point. Though his own education is not very liberal, he is most anxious to bring up his children in the best possible way. All his children but one have been educated in the Government schools. He sent his eldest son to Calcutta, gave him a University training there, and has now sent him to Glasgow to study medicine. His second son is the first Indian to have passed the competitive examination for the Civil Service of the Colony. He is unable to send his youngest daughter to the Government Primary School, and, in spite of his efforts, was prevented from getting his third son, a promising youth, admitted to the Durban High School. It may be stated that this family has been living in the European style. All the children have been brought up from their infancy to speak English and naturally they speak it very well. Why this child should be shut out when all his other children have been allowed to enter the Government School passes comprehension. This instance shows, more vividly than anything else could, how difficult the position of the Indians inferior to Mr. Godfrey must be.

The Natal Parliament, dubbed by Mr. Rhodes "the parochial assembly" in South Africa, is now sitting, and the Attorney-General, who is also Minister of Education, and who is supposed to be a gentleman with a conscience, and who is undoubtedly an otherwise esteemed gentleman, has been telling the inquisitive members of the Natal Parliament that his Government have been the first to close the doors of the Government schools against the Indians. Therefore a simple appeal to him to do justice by at any rate leaving the Government schools free to the children of those parents that have hitherto been allowed to educate their children there, has absolutely no effect, and all for the sake of a few miserable votes—for that is what is at the bottom of all this unrighteous and unreasoning opposition to the Indians. The ministers do not—dare not—do what is right, lest their doing so may jeopardise their position at the next general election. When responsible government was granted to Natal, those who clamoured for it were loud in their protestations that full justice would be done to those who did not possess the franchise. After the colony became a self-governing colony, Sir John Robinson, the first Prime Minister under the new form of government, in introducing the Indian Disfranchising Bill, said that the colony—that is to say, in his estimation, the Europeans—were fully aware of the increased responsibilities that naturally went with the increased freedom they enjoyed, and their still further increased responsibilities in that they were depriving the Indians of the franchise they possessed. The unfortunate Indians, it would appear, almost prophetically said that talk of that description was meant for consumption in the Colonial Office in Downing Street, and that it deceived nobody in Natal. They said that the disfranchisement was merely the thin edge of the wedge, and that if the Home Government yielded to the pressure from the Natal Government it would practically mean ruin for the Indians. All this has come only too true. The poor Indians have known no rest since responsible government has been granted. One after another the elementary rights of British citizenship have been snatched away from them, and if Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Curzon are not wide awake the British Indians in Natal will one of these days find themselves stripped of all that they have been taught to believe they possess as subjects of the Queen Empress.

The dissatisfaction that the latest move on the part of the Natal Government in the matter of education has caused among the Indian converts to Christianity, of whom there is a large number, is indeed very intense. They, of all others, know fully, and have been taught to understand, the advantages of Western culture. They are taught by their religious teachers the doctrine of equality. They are told, Sunday after Sunday, that their Great Master knew no distinction between a Jew and a Gentile, a European or an Asiatic. Small wonder, then, if they feel keenly the disabilities that are sought to be imposed upon them in the educational line. It is difficult to say where the present agitation against the Indians will end. The wish of the white Colonists may perhaps fairly be said to be embodied in the following extracts from the speeches of well-known members of the Natal Parliament:—"Mr. Palmer thought it undesirable that so large an increase should be made in the money voted for the education of Indians, who were thus being fitted to supplant the children of white Colonists. Mr. Payn moved that the item be struck out, remarking that Indians who came here had the right of leaving the Colony. There were thirteen blacks (?) to every white in Natal, and yet Parliament was voting money to educate the blacks to oust Europeans. Some people were doing worse than that—selling land to blacks, which would be the foundation of the strength of the coloured people here in the future."—(*Natal Mercury*, June 8, 1899.) It need not take a long time to know on which side justice lies. Sir Harry H. Johnston, whose name is well known to your readers, rightly says in his recent book on the "Colonisation of Africa":—"On the other hand, from the Imperial point of view—from what I call the policy of the black, white, and yellow—it seems unjust that her Majesty's Indian subjects should not be allowed to circulate as freely as those of her lieges who can claim European descent" (p. 177). And after all, is it not the Imperial point of view alone which is worth considering, and before which every other view must bend? It is to be hoped that the public in India will be sufficiently alive to the importance of this question, which in its widest aspects affects not only the 50,000 Indians in Natal, but each one of the 300 millions who may care to go out of India in search of livelihood.

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c., ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. } **5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.**

MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (*Temple Classics Series*) **Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.**

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the Right Hon. Professor MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by Miss E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. Publishers, DENT & CO., London.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold undertaking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bards of the country." *Prof. Max Muller's Introduction.*

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. . . . Puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded festivals."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive binding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopædic pictures of Indian civilisation in the remote past, its pathos, its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., President.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

Soho Square, National Hospital, London, W.

Vol. I.—To Concentration of Army on Frontier.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR.

1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

Formerly in Punjab Frontier Force and late Commanding at Delhi, Author of "Indian Problems," etc.

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."

ATHENÆUM.—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."

MORNING LEADER.—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

A. CONSTABLE, 2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, LONDON.

Price, Net—10s.

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.

Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

PART I.—**Original Articles.**

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. Eardley Norton, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, B.A., LL.B.
INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Esq., C.I.E.
INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. John Adam, Esq., M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
THE POVERTY OF INDIA. Alfred Nundy, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA. P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.
THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. Sorab Pestonji N. Wadia, Esq.,
THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.I.
THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. Parameswaran Pillay, Esq., B.A.
RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. Subramania Aiyar, Esq., B.A.

PART II.—**All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.**

PART III.—**All the past Congress Resolutions.**

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co., Publishers, Esplanade, Madras.
In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "India,"
84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.
Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

Dr. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., New Medical Hall, Meerut.

TRADE MARK. JVARA-HARI.

is what its name implies FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
C. E. Wood, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "India," should be made to

The Manager,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85 Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.